	Case 1:21-cv-01616-DAD-BAM Docume	nt 21 Filed 04/13/22 Page 1 of 2
1 2 3 4 5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	STEWART MANAGO,	No. 1:21-cv-01616-DAD-BAM (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
14	KELLY SANTORO, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 16)
16		
17	Plaintiff Stewart Manago is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this action filed pursuant	
18	to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28	
19	U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On February 14, 2022, plaintiff filed a motion for a protective order. (Doc. No. 14.) On	
21	February 17, 2022, the assigned magistrate judge construed plaintiff's motion as a motion for	
22	preliminary injunctive relief and issued findings and recommendations recommending that	
23	plaintiff's motion be denied. (Doc. No. 16.) The assigned magistrate judge recommended that	
24	the motion be denied because plaintiff has failed to file a second amended complaint after the	
25	magistrate judge had found that his first amended complaint failed to state any cognizable claims.	
26	(Id.) Those findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any	
27	objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. ( <i>Id.</i> at 3–4.) Plaintiff	
28	filed objections on March 3, 2022. (Doc. No. 19.) Therein, plaintiff requests that the court	
		1
	1	

## Case 1:21-cv-01616-DAD-BAM Document 21 Filed 04/13/22 Page 2 of 2 consider the allegations contained in his first amended complaint. (*Id.*) However, for the reasons already correctly stated in the magistrate judge's screening order (Doc. No. 15), plaintiff has failed to state any cognizable claim for relief in his first amended complaint. Therefore, plaintiff's objections are not persuasive and provide no basis upon which to reject the pending findings and recommendations. Accordingly, 1. The findings and recommendations issued on February 17, 2022 (Doc. No. 16) are adopted; 2. Plaintiff's motion for a protective order (Doc. No. 14) is denied; and This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings. 3. IT IS SO ORDERED. **April 13, 2022** Dated: